



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/788,493	02/21/2001	Allan Henrik Suonpera	004770.00621	6757
22907 7590 08/04/2010 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051				
EXAMINER				
PAN, YUWEN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/04/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/788,493

Applicant(s)

SUONPERA ET AL.

Examiner

YUWEN PAN

Art Unit

2618

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 60-94 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 60-92 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 93-94 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 91-94 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 60-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Littig et al (US005524276A, hereinafter Littig) in view of Ishigami (US006625445B1) and in further view of Piosenka et al (US005926756A, hereinafter Piosenka).

Per claim 60, Littig discloses a method comprising: establishing, at a computing device (see figure 4A, item 401), a connection between a first mobile communication device (see item 401) and the computing device, wherein the computing device is different from the first mobile communication device; and receiving, at the computing device, the personalized information transferred from a memory of the first mobile communication device to a memory of the computing device (see figure 7 and item 707). Littig does not teach that the personalized information includes at least one of: settings of the first mobile communication device, a calendar, a phonebook and a message. Ishigami teaches data transfer between a mobile phone and a computer wherein the data is phone directory (see figure 1 item 104, column 3 and lines 47-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the references to ensure that all the user personal information would be saved and transfer to the computer.

Combination of Littig and Ishigami does not teaches displaying at the computing device, a user interface comprising a list of personalized information types; receiving, through the user interface displayed at the computing device, a user selection of personalized information (repertory directory, and feature set) to transfer from the first mobile communication device to the computing device, and wherein the selection is received prior to initiating transfer of the personalized information (see figure 7 and corresponding paragraphs); receiving, user input corresponding to a command to initiate transfer of the selected personalized information from the first mobile communication device to the computing device wherein the user selection is different from the user input corresponding to the command to initiate transfer and wherein the user selection is received prior to receiving the command to initiate transfer of the selected personalize information and initiating transfer of the selected personalized information in response to the receiving the command. Piosenka teaches such user interaction (see figure 5-7 and corresponding paragraphs). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Piosenka with the combination of Littig and Ishigami in order to provide the user controlling ability to allow user to interact with the system.

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to claims 68, and 74.

Per claim 78, Ishigami discloses a method performed by a computing device (see figure 1 and item 20) comprising: receiving a request to write previously stored personalized information stored at the computing device to a mobile communication device (see figure 1 and

item 10, see figure 6, DATA TRANSFER RQ), wherein ; displaying a list of a plurality of personalized information previously stored at the computing device, , a calendar, a phonebook (phone directories) and a message (see column 4 and lines 30-48); receiving a selection of the previously stored personalized information from the plurality of previously stored personalized information (see column 5 and lines 39-column 6 and lines 40, receiving search for phone directories information); and sending the selected previously stored personalized information to the mobile communication device (see figure 6 and corresponding paragraphs). Ishigami does not expressly teach that n the plurality of previously stored personalized information includes at least one of: settings of the mobile communication device and wherein the previously stored personalized information is received from a second mobile communication device different from the first mobile communication device. Littig teaches a mobile communication device is able to transfer its information to another one and later the another one is able to transfer data information back to the mobile communication device (see figure 4A and 4C, and corresponding paragraphs) and wherein the previously stored personalized information is received from a second mobile communication device different from the first mobile communication device (see figure 4A and 4C and corresponding paragraphs). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references to backup information and later retrieve it back.

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to claims 83 and 87.

Per claim 61, Ishigami further teaches that the established connection is a wire-based data connection (see figure 1 item 107 and 206).

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to claim 69.

Per claim 62, Littig further teaches that the selection of the personalized information is received by a data transfer application executing on the computing device (see figure 6E and corresponding paragraphs).

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to claim 70, 75.

Per claim 63, Littig further teaches sending the personalized information to a second mobile communication device (see figure 4c, item 405).

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to claim 71

Per claim 64, Littig further teaches evaluating, at the computing device, the second mobile communication device's capabilities (power) to receive the personalized information; and modifying, at the computing device, the personalized information in accordance with the second mobile communication device's capabilities prior to sending the personalized information to the second mobile communication device (see column 2 and lines 13-26). And Piosenka further teaches each of at least one information record corresponding to a single entry in the at least one of: the settings of the first mobile communication device, the phonebook.

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to claims 72, 76, 79, 84, and 88.

Per claim 65, Littig further teaches that the second mobile communication device's capabilities include a data field size (20 repertory directories) for storing each of the at least one information record (see column 8 and lines 16-21, see figure 6E and item 648).

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to claims 73, 77, 80, 85 and 89.

Per claim 66, Littig further teaches modifying the personalized information includes truncating the personalized information to fit within the data field size of the second mobile communication device (see figure 6E, item 649, only 20 repertory locations are copied to the second mobile communication device).

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to claim 81, 86 and 90.

Per claim 67, Littig further teaches modifying the personalized information includes modifying (converting) a data type of the personalized information (see figure 6E and item 638).

Same arguments apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to claim 82.

Per claim 91, Piosenka further teaches displaying, in a list, each of the selected personalized information types that has not been sent to the first mobile communication device in a first state and each of the selected personalized information type has been sent to the first mobile communication device in a second state different from the first state (see figure 6 and 8 and corresponding paragraphs).

4. Claims 92 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Littig et al (US005524276A, hereinafter Littig) in view of Ishigami (US006625445B1) and in further view of Piosenka et al (US005926756A, hereinafter Piosenka) and Burba et al (US006601232B1, hereinafter Burba).

Per claim 92, combination of Littig, Ishigami and Piosenka does not teach that during copying, the system is able to check whether copied information already exists. Burba teaches such features (see column 10 and line 66-column 11 and line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the reference to prevent un-necessary duplication.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 93 and 94 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YUWEN PAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7855. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yuwen Pan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618